

REMARKS

Applicant affirms the election to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-19 and 23, without traverse. Claims 14-23 are cancelled. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite that the retractable or roll-up door is a flexible door, and that the door is moveable, rather than extendible (i.e., that the door itself does not stretch or expand e.g., like a spring). New claims 24-31 have been added. New claim 24 describes the door with cables that are removable from the channels, i.e., in the embodiment of Figs. 7 and 8, the cables are not captive. New claim 26 is generally similar to claim 14, but with a more clear description of the elements. New dependent claims 27-31 are essentially the same as claims 15-19 and depend from new claim 26.

New claim 25 includes the content of objected to claim 4 and claim 1, with the edge elements in lines 3-5 and 8 of claim 1 changed to provide a better description. In view of the comments on claim 4 at the top of page 6 of the 5/13/2005 Office Action, new claim 25 is believed to be allowable with further comment. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the other claims is requested in view of the following remarks.

Turning to the § 102 rejections with respect to claims 1 and 14, McSwain does not teach or suggest a cargo container having first and second side walls with curved front edges, as claimed. Rather, McSwain discloses a canopy shelter 10 including lateral side rails 16 that have straight front (or top) edges (see Figs. 3 and 6). The Office Action, at page 3, states that "the top of [rails] 16 have a slight curvature." The rails 16, however, are not curved at the front or the top, but are straight and flat, as is clearly shown in Fig 3. While there is some curvature at the outer side edges of the rails 16, the rails are not curved at all on their front or top edges.

Applicant does not disagree here that "front" may well be a matter of orientation. However, the point here is that the door in claim 1 is moveable along a curved surface, regardless as to whether that surface is characterized as a "front" surface or another surface. In McSwain, the canopy 12 only moves over a straight surface. Thus, claims 1 and 14 are patentable over McSwain.

Relative to claims 1 and 11, McSwain does not teach or suggest a retractable door that is extendible along the curved front wall, or curved front edge of first and second side walls, of a cargo container, as claimed. Rather, as illustrated in Fig. 3, the door 12 in McSwain is extendible along a non-curved top flange 18 of each of the side rails 16. The door 12 does not extend to the curved side edges of the side rails 16 (see Fig. 3), and the top flanges 18 along which it extends are straight and flat. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 11 are patentable over McSwain.

Additionally, with respect to claim 14 (and dependent claim 2), McSwain does not teach or suggest first and second support members having first and second channels, with the first and second support members attached along curved front edges of first and second side walls of a cargo container, as claimed. Rather, McSwain discloses a guide slot 22 located in a straight portion of each of the side rails 16 (see claims 3 and 6). Thus, the guide slots 22 are not located in support members attached along curved front edges of side walls, but rather are located in non-curved portions of the side rails 16. Accordingly, claims 2 and 14 are believed to be separately patentable over McSwain.

Turning to the §102 and §103 rejections relative to new claim 25, Jones does not disclose a cargo container including a retractable door having cables attached to two sides of the retractable door, as claimed. Rather, Jones discloses a retractable window

screen. The window screen includes a gripping mechanism, including a lever 28, for gripping the edge of the screen fabric 19 itself (see p.2, col. 1, ll. 13-34). There is no cable attached to either side of the screen fabric 19, and the lever 28 itself does not secure a cable, or the screen fabric 19, into one or more channels in the window frame. Rather, the lever 28 is rotatable to move a portion 25 of a clamping strip 23 into engagement with the screen fabric 19. Thus, the window screen disclosed in Jones lacks several of the limitations of claim 25. Jones is also completely unrelated to the claimed cargo container.

Turning to the § 103 rejections of claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 9-11, claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite that the retractable or roll-up door is a flexible door. Applicant submits that Mittelman and Looker do not teach or suggest a flexible door that is extendible along curved front edges or a curved front wall of an air cargo container, as claimed. Indeed, none of the cited references disclose a retractable door that is extendible over any curved surface. Thus, claims 1 and 11 are believed to be patentable over the combination of Mittelman and Looker, since a claimed element is entirely lacking from these references.

Additionally, neither Mittelman nor Looker discloses a flexible retractable door, as recited in amended claims 1 and 11. Rather, Mittelman discloses a rigid sliding door 35 (see Fig. 2), and Looker discloses non-retractable, removable, inflexible door panels 17 and 19 (see Figs. 1 and 2). There is no suggestion in either reference to provide a flexible door. The sliding door 35 in Mittelman is permanently positioned within door tracks. The removable door panels 17, 19 in Looker are designed to fit exactly into designated locations on the air cargo container. The claimed flexible door, conversely, may be used as a cargo loading template to identify and prevent cargo from

protruding out of the container (see application, paragraph 0009). Thus, claims 1 and 11 are believed to be patentable over the combination of Mittelman and Looker for this reason, as well.

New claim 24 recites that the retractable door includes cables that are removably positionable in first and second channels in first and second side walls of the cargo container. None of the cited references teach or suggest a retractable door having cables that are removable from channels in a cargo container. Thus, claim 24 is believed to be patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is requested.

Dated: August 8, 2005

Customer No. 34055
Perkins Coie LLP
Patent - LA
P.O. Box 1208
Seattle, WA 98111-1208
Phone: (310) 788-9900
Fax: (206) 332-7198

Respectfully submitted,

PERKINS COIE LLP

By: Kenneth H. Ohriner
Kenneth H. Ohriner
Reg. No. 31,646